

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/632,536 | HOLZAPFEL ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Patrick J. Connolly | 2877 | |

All Participants:

(1) Patrick J. Connolly.

(2) John Freeman.

Status of Application: Pending, prior to 1st Action

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 9 December 2005

Time: Afternoon

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1-17

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Application contained a misfiled Preliminary Amendment associated with Application 10/380,847. It was confirmed that the amendment did not belong in the Application, and that the originally filed Claims and Specification were intended for examination. The amendment was removed via PALM and MADRAS..